



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/079,426

02/22/2002

Petri Koskelainen

60282.00294

7008

32294

7590

08/21/2006

SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY L.L.P.
14TH FLOOR
8000 TOWERS CRESCENT
TYSONS CORNER, VA 22182

EXAMINER

TAYLOR, NICHOLAS R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2141

DATE MAILED: 08/21/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/079,426	KOSKELAINEN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nicholas R. Taylor	2141	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _____ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 April 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 60-91 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 60-91 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 February 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114.

Applicant's submission filed on April 19th, 2006, has been entered.

2. Claims 60-91 have been presented for examination and are rejected.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed April 19th, 2006, with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Art Unit: 2141

5. Claims 60-63, 66-77, 80-87, 90, and 91 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Cook (U.S. Patent 6,697,806).

6. As per claims 60, 74, 90, and 91, Cook teaches a method for provisioning services to a terminal, which terminal is adapted to perform communication via at least one communication network, each network being equipped with service processing entities, comprising the steps of:

requesting, by said terminal, a specified service to be at a disposition of said requesting terminal; (Cook, col. 9, lines 4-12; fig. 5 items 512, 562, 564)

analyzing said request by an analyzing entity associated with said at least one communication network, (Cook, col. 9, lines 30-41)

said analyzing entity configured to be associable with a plurality of communication networks; (Cook, col. 8, lines 49-65; see overview of fig. 5 with multiple networks including items 530 and 540)

deciding, by said analyzing entity, that said requested specified service is associated a service processing entity of a specific one of said at least one communication network, and (Cook, col. 9, lines 30-41)

in response to said decision, routing communication messages associated with said terminal via said analyzing entity to said specific one of said service processing entities within said specified communication network (Cook, where message routing is described in col. 14, lines 44-50; see fig. 12 process steps 1212, 1214, 1216, and 1218).

7. As per claims 61 and 75, Cook teaches the system further wherein requesting said specified service comprises indicating said specified service in a request message (Cook, col. 17, lines 38-44; col. 17, line 59 to col. 18, line 4; see also fig. 16 steps 1604, 1608, and 1612).
8. As per claims 62 and 76, Cook teaches the system further wherein said specified service is indicated by a service identifier carried in said request message (Cook, col. 17, lines 38-44; col. 17, line 59 to col. 18, line 4; see also fig. 16 steps 1604, 1608, and 1612).
9. As per claims 63 and 77, Cook teaches the system further wherein said identifier is carried in the user data payload in said request message (Cook, col. 17, lines 38-44; fig. 16).
10. As per claims 66 and 80, Cook teaches the system further wherein said request message comprises at least a subscriber identifier (Cook, fig. 16 item 1608).
11. As per claims 67 and 81, Cook teaches the system further comprising the steps:
detecting that said request message does not comprise a service identifier; and

in response thereto, retrieving said service identifier based on said subscriber identifier from a database entity (Cook, col. 17, lines 45-58; see fig. 16, decision branch starting at step 1604 with the answer NO; see also database system of fig. 6).

12. As per claims 68 and 82, Cook teaches the system further wherein said service identifier comprises a network code and/or a service code (Cook, col. 17, lines 38-44; col. 17, line 59 to col. 18, line 4; see also fig. 16 steps 1604, 1608, and 1612).

13. As per claims 69 and 83, Cook teaches the system further wherein said service identifier comprises a network code and/or a service code (Cook, col. 17, lines 38-44; col. 17, line 59 to col. 18, line 4; see also fig. 16 steps 1604, 1608, and 1612).

14. As per claims 70 and 84, Cook teaches the system further wherein said network code represents a respective one of said communication networks (Cook, col. 17, lines 38-44; col. 17, line 59 to col. 18, line 4; see also fig. 16 steps 1604, 1608, and 1612, wherein the identifier represents the service provider at the destination network).

15. As per claim 71 and 85, Cook teaches the system further wherein the service code represents a respective one of the services to be processed at the corresponding service processing entity (Cook, col. 17, lines 38-44; col. 17, line 59 to col. 18, line 4; see also fig. 16 steps 1604, 1608, and 1612).

Art Unit: 2141

16. As per claims 72 and 86, Cook teaches the system further wherein said communication networks are distinguishable by at least one of the network type and/or the network operator (Cook, col. 9, lines 29-41, wherein service communication is handled specific to the network type).

17. As per claims 73 and 87, Cook teaches the system further wherein said services are distinguishable by at least one of the terminal type, subscriber identifier, subscriber profiles, manufacturer of the terminal, capabilities of the terminal or vendor of the terminal (Cook, col. 9, lines 29-41, e.g. when terminal capabilities and the subscriber profiles are used).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

18. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

19. Claims 64, 65, 78, and 79 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cook (U.S. Patent 6,697,806) and Davis et al. (US PGPub 2003/0041146).

20. As per claims 64 and 78, Cook teaches the above, yet fails to teach wherein the identifier is carried in a header of said request message.

Davis teaches a connection allocation method (Davis, paragraph 0019) that uses service codes representing services via message headers (Davis, paragraph 0049 & 0052, figure 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have combined Cook and Davis to provide the service code headers of Davis in the system of Cook, because doing so would allow intelligent and high speed connection decisions providing enhanced network services (Davis, paragraph 0018).

21. As per claims 65 and 79, Cook teaches the above, yet fails to teach wherein the identifier is piggybacked to the header.

Davis teaches a connection allocation method (Davis, paragraph 0019) that uses service codes representing services via message headers (Davis, paragraph 0049 & 0052, figure 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have combined Cook and Davis to provide the service code headers of Davis in the system of Cook, because doing so would allow intelligent and high speed connection decisions providing enhanced network services (Davis, paragraph 0018).

22. Claims 88 and 89 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cook (U.S. Patent 6,697,806)) and Nguyen et al. (US PGPub 2003/0005132).

23. As per claims 88 and 89, Cook teaches the above, yet fails to teach wherein said request message is transported using the Session Initiation Protocol (SIP).

Nguyen teaches a network with multiple service processing entities selectable for communication within the network (Nguyen, paragraphs 0029-0030 and figure 2) for service requests that use the Session Initiation Protocol (Nguyen, paragraphs 0068-0070).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have combined Cook and Nguyen to provide the multiple services of Nguyen in the system of Cook, because doing so would decrease management and maintenance requirements while improving scalability (Cook, paragraph 0007) and enable the use of the Session Initiation Protocol to achieve services such as Voice Over Internet Protocol (Cook, paragraph 0069).

Conclusion


24. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicholas Taylor whose telephone number is (571) 272-3889. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:00am to 5:30pm, with alternating Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on (571) 272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 305-3718.

Art Unit: 2141

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Nicholas Taylor
Examiner
Art Unit 2141


RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER